REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 30, 2009. Claims 1, 8 and 10 to 13, all of which are independent claims, are pending in the application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, those claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly define the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 10 to clarify that it is directed to a method of controlling an information processing apparatus. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Published Appln. No. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,467 (Morita). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns downloading images from a Web server for printing. In one aspect of the invention, when downloading image data from a Web server and after transmitting the image data from a cache memory to a printer, image data which is stored in the cache memory and is not designated to be printed, is deleted from the cache memory and a

second list is overwritten with a first list. These features make it possible to avoid repeatedly downloading same image data from the Web server during consecutive rounds of printing.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that has a Web browser and displays a screen based on a predetermined file provided from a Web server through a network. The apparatus includes a first list creator that creates a first list of a plurality of image data selected designated to be printed, using the plug-in which is activated in response to a command from the Web server; a cache memory that stores printed image data which has been during previous rounds of printing; a second list creator that creates a second list of the printed image data stored in said cache memory, using the plug-in; a comparison unit that compares the first list and the second list, after next images to be printed are selected and the first list is updated before performing the print processing for the next images using the plug-in; an acquisition unit that acquires, from the Web server, the selected image data from the Web server; a print processor that performs print processing to the image data stored in said cache memory, using the plug-in; a deletion unit that deletes, from the cache memory, the image data which is not included in the first list but included in the second list; and an updater that updates the second list on the first list after the acquisition unit acquires the image data from the server device. The acquisition unit does not acquire image data which is included in the first and second lists.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Holmstead and Morita, whether considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the information processing apparatus of Claim 1. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of a first list creator that creates a first list of a plurality of image data selected designated to be printed, using a plug-

in which is activated in response to a command from a Web server, a cache memory that stores printed image data which has been printed during previous rounds of printing, a second list creator that creates a second list of the printed image data stored in said cache memory, using the plug-in, a deletion unit that deletes, from the cache memory, the image data which is not included in the first list but included in the second list and an updater that updates the second list on the first list after the acquisition unit acquires the image data from the server device.

In contrast to the present invention, Holmstead discloses that a printer receives a print job ticket and stores the print job ticket temporarily in an input buffer. A local memory is searched for any prior print job elements that were previously stored and that match one or more print job elements referenced by the references in the print job ticket. If there are any print job elements referenced by the references in the print job ticket that are not present in the local memory, then the printer downloads the print job elements from one or more remote sites. In other words, if any print job elements are not present in local memory, then printer treats the event as a cache miss and retrieves the elements from one or more remote sites. On the other hand, if there are one or more print job elements already in local memory, then the printer is able to retrieve the one or more print job elements from local memory instead of downloading them from a remote sites. In other words, if any print job elements are present in the local memory, then the printer treats the event as a cache hit and retrieves the one or more print job elements from local memory.

The printer then compiles all the print job elements to form a print ready document. The print job elements are compiled once the data associated with the print job elements referenced by the print job ticket are downloaded from remote sites or are already present in local memory as a result of a previous print job ticket.

After producing a print ready document, the printer retains the print job elements in the local memory for possible later retrieval in the event a future print job ticket references any of the one or more retained print job elements. These retained print job elements are therefore stored in local memory after the print job ticket has been processed by the printer. (See Holmstead, Fig. 4 and paragraphs [0038] to [0044]).

However, Holmstead does not disclose any methodology to manage deletion of previously printed image data stored in a cache memory as does the present invention. In an apparatus in accordance with Claim 1, a first list creator creates a first list of a plurality of image data selected designated to be printed, using a plug-in which is activated in response to a command from a Web server. A cache memory is used to store printed image data which has been printed during previous rounds of printing and a second list is created of the printed image data stored in said cache memory, using the plug-in. Then, the image data which is not included in the first list but included in the second list is deleted and the second list is updated on the first list after the image data is acquired from the server device. These cache memory management features performed by a plug-in are neither disclosed nor suggested by Holmstead.

Morefore, Morita merely discloses, that in order to shorten access time needed for accessing a File Access Table (FAT) in a Hard Disk Drive (HDD), the FAT is stored in RAM and the FAT in RAM is updated when files in the HDD are changed. Then the FAT in the HDD is updated by the FAT in RAM. The FAT in Morita is merely information showing positions of data in the HDD. Neither the first list for managing a plurality of image data designated to be printed nor the second list for managing the printed image data stored in said cache memory as featured in Claim 1 are disclosed in Morita. Therefore, Morita does not cure the deficiencies in Holmstead.

In light of the deficiencies of Holmstead and Morita as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claims 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are directed to a computer-readable medium, a method, an apparatus, a method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Finally, the previous claim count totaled 3 (20 having been paid-for), all of which were independent claims. The present amendment adds another 3 independent claims, bringing the total claim count to 6, all of which are independent. Therefore, the fee difference between the previous claim count and the current claim count is 3 additional independent claims. Accordingly, the Director is hereby authorized to charge $660 for additional claims to Deposit Account 50-3939. The Director is further authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3011255v1